

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Non-Final Office Action dated December 24, 2008, has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

In the Office Action, claim 16 is objected to because of the following informalities: The recitation of "in a production line;" in line 4~5 should be amended to "in a production line;". The recitation of "pasteif" in line 11 should be amended to "paste if". Claim 16 has been amended. As such, the objection is overcome. Withdrawal of the objection is requested.

Claims 16 and 21~23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent Publication No. 2001/0013920 to *Hashimoto* (hereinafter "*Hashimoto*"), in view of Japanese Patent No. 61-055625 to *Yamamoto* (hereinafter "*Yamamoto*").

Claim 16 and 21~23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Hashimoto* in view of *Yamamoto* as applied to claim 16 above, and further in view of United States Patent Publication No. 2003/0083203 to *Hashimoto* (hereinafter "*Hashimoto* '203").

Claims 16 and 21~22 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 11 and 13 of copending Application No. 10/691,662.

Claim 23 is provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 10~11 and 13~15 of copending Application No. 10/691,662 in view of *Hashimoto*.

With this response, claim 16 has been amended. No new matter has been added. Accordingly, claims 16 and 21~23 are currently pending in this application with claims 1~15 and 24~28 having been withdrawn in response to the Examiner's requirement for restriction.

Claims 16 and 21~23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Hashimoto* in view of *Yamamoto*. Claim 16 and 21~23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Hashimoto* in view of *Yamamoto* as applied to claim 16 above, and

further in view of *Hashimoto '203*. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Claim 16 is allowable over the cited references in that claim 16 recites a combination of elements including, for example, “providing a plurality of silver-sealant complex dispensers for forming a silver dot and a seal pattern with one apparatus above the tables”, “respectively loading substrates on the tables, wherein the substrates are selected in a cell process performed in a production line form and wherein the tables operate independently along a transferring path of the substrates”, “supplying a dispensing material to the plurality of silver-sealant complex dispensers including a plurality of syringes, wherein the dispensing material is one of sealant and silver paste, wherein the silver-sealant complex dispensers include a plurality of first dispensers filled with sealant for forming a seal pattern and a plurality of second dispensers filled with silver paste for forming a silver dot, and the first and second dispensers are respectively formed at both sides of the tables and wherein the plurality of second dispensers are filled with sealant instead of silver paste if silver dot is not required according to a model of a liquid crystal display panel” and “supplying the dispensing material to the substrates having a plurality of unit panels through nozzles at the end of the syringes”.

As described in the specification of the present invention, when a dispenser for seal pattern and a dispenser for silver dot are respectively formed at both sides of one table, a seal process and a silver dot process may be performed all in the same apparatus, and accordingly processing steps may be reduced in comparison with a case performing the sealing process and the silver process separately.

In the meantime, the dispensing unit includes the first dispenser for forming a seal pattern and the second dispenser for forming a silver dot, however the syringe may be filled with sealant instead of silver paste to form a seal pattern if silver dot is not required according to a model of a liquid crystal display panel.

In more detail, in the present invention, the liquid crystal display device in which silver dot forming is required is described as an example. However, when there is no need to perform the silver dot process, such as fabricating IPS liquid crystal display devices, a seal process is performed by filling sealant in the syringe of the dispenser for forming the silver dot, and decreased efficiency because of the idle apparatus may be prevented.

However, none of the cited references, singly or in combination, teaches or suggestions at least the aforementioned features of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 16 is allowable over the cited references.

Accordingly, claim 16 and claims 21~23, which depend either directly or indirectly from claim 16, are allowable over *Hashimoto* in view of *Yamamoto*. Moreover, claim 16 and claims 21~23, which depend either directly or indirectly upon claim 16, are allowable over *Hashimoto* in view of *Yamamoto*, and further in view of *Hashimoto* '203.

Claims 16~22 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 10~11 and 13~15 of copending Application No. 10/691,662. And, claim 23 is provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 10~11 and 13~15 of copending Application No. 10/691,662 in view of *Hashimoto*. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections in light of the amendment of claim 16.

Applicant believes the foregoing amendments and remarks place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

Application No.: 10/825,362
Amdt. dated April 24, 2009
Reply to Office Action dated December 24, 2008

Docket No.: 8733.1024.00

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911.

Dated: April 24, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By Valerie P. Hayes
Valerie P. Hayes
Registration No.: 53,005
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorneys for Applicant